

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/901,548	•	07/09/2001	Hironori Utsugi	01405/LH	7117	
1933	7590	01/12/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	

FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 767 THIRD AVENUE 25TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10017-2023

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

NGUYEN, THONG Q

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	in
Advisom, Action	09/901,548	UTSUGI, HIRONORI	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thong Q. Nguyen	2872	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 19 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a  inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1  condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea  Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice to the same of the sa	cation. A proper reply ch places the applica	y to a tion in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of time may be calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extent the final Office action; or (2)	sion fee under as set forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's</li> <li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims	<b>3</b> .
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · ——		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT	place the
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-4,6,10-12 and 14-16</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>5 and 7-9</u> .			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		11 +	
9. Other:	(0)( 1 TO 1440) 1 apol 140(5).		
IV VIIIGI		INC INChe	_

Thong Q. Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2872

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/901,548

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendments as made in the amendment are not directed to the elected claims which claims are examined..

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the device as claimed is not patentable with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.